

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
December 3, 2015**

NOTE: These are summary minutes only. There are no tapes available of this meeting.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Scott Meade, Scott Waggoner, Kevin Sutton, Joe Palmquist, Craig Krueger

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Mike Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Ben Sticka, Planner; Sarah Vanags, Planner, Steven Fischer, Manager

RECORDING SECRETARY: Steven Fischer

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Zoning Code.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chair David Scott Meade at 7:10p.m.

MINUTES

THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. MOTION APPROVED (5-0) .

APPROVAL

LAND-2015-01812, Vintage Racing Motors Building Addition

Description: Metal building addition of approximately 4,192 sf to an existing 20,265 sf sprinklered building. New parking stalls with planters will be installed. Addition will be used as an automobile showroom.

Location: 9255 151st Avenue NE

Architect: Lawrence Aranda with MBA Architects

Staff Contact: Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470, bsticka@redmond.gov

Mr. Sticka noted that this application was approved at the previous meeting; however, at that time the application had not yet completed the PREP process. Staff was asking for the Board to formally approve the application at this time.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. PALMQUIST AND SECONDED BY MR. WAGGONER TO APPROVE LAND-2015-01812 VINTAGE RACING MOTORS BUILDING ADDITION, WITH THE STANDARD STAFF PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES CONDITIONS. MOTION APPROVED (5-0)

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2015-02200, Bear Creek Mixed-Use

Description: 6-story, mixed-use building with 360 residential units, 5,000 sf live/work apartments and associated parking

Location: 15806 to 15904 Bear Creek Parkway

Applicant: Gary Noyes with NW Pacific Development, LLC

Staff Contact: Sarah Vanags, 425-556-2426, svanags@redmond.gov

Ms. Vanags stated that this was a 5 story mixed-use building located on north side of Bear Creek Parkway between Redmond Way and 161st Street NE. The project is currently proposed in two phases. Phase one would consist of approximately 190 units and phase two would introduce the remaining 170 units and common open space features on the 75,575 square foot site. The five stories will be constructed atop a two story concrete parking structure that will be partially below grade and is proposed to provide 363 parking spaces and storage for 360 bicycles. The project will be adjacent on the north side to the Sound Transit rail tracks which are proposed to run the length of the property east to west. The massing of the building will offer the opportunity to conceal the rail tracks, maintenance area and associated facilities from being in view from Bear Creek Parkway.

Additionally, the applicant has requested the following deviations for the project:

- 1.) Reduction in rear setback from 14 feet to 0 feet for on the northwest side for the parking structure only. (Approved by Technical Committee November 11th, 2015)
- 2.) Reduction in rear setback from 14 feet to 10 feet for the residential portion of the building on the northwest side of the building. The north east portion from the courtyard east will remain 14 feet for both the parking structure and residential units. (Approved by Technical Committee November 11th, 2015)
- 3.) Allow live work units to be constructed at street level in replacement of commercial space. The units would be constructed to meet commercial needs so they are able to be smoothly converted as the demand presents itself further for commercial uses. (Currently under review)
- 4.) Reduction in parking to the King County Right Sized Parking calculator minimum, 0.97 spaces per unit. (Currently under review)

Staff would like the applicant to review the color palette as shown within the proposed elevations. Specifically, staff would like to request that the applicant consider an alternative to the yellow currently chosen. This palette is similar to proposed adjacent developments currently under review or construction and exploring an alternative in the color palette may support project's design in being more distinctive.

Kent Smuntley spoke for the applicant stated that the project proposed to fill the trail area at the rear of the site for access from the podium to the trail. The project is two buildings that relate to each other but not exactly alike. Vertical elements are used to break up the mass of the structures. Picture frame elements are used in Phase I Building and will be used differently in the Phase II Building.

The project proposes to construct the parking podium and the Phase I Building first with a zero setback to the trail at the rear. The plaza and the Phase II Building will follow with a 14-foot setback from the trail.

The Phase I Building is proposed to have live/work units at the plaza defined by masonry bollards. A water feature will be created at the plaza entrance. The Phase II Building will have a different color scheme and there will be a different treatment of the materials. A scored concrete podium is proposed.

Jason Anderson spoke to the landscape scheme saying that there will be street trees along Bear Creek Parkway. Big Leaf Maple and Doug fir with a native palette will be used across the back of the building

near the trail. There will be landscaped pots on the podium with a mix of native plant material, golden bamboo, and vine maple for privacy.

Ms. Vanags stated that the City appreciated the modulation of the buildings and that the landscaping will screen the Sound Transit tracks and storage. The trees proposed will be more mature when Sound Transit breaks ground for their project.

Mr. Krueger

- Said that it is unfortunate that Sound Transit will be removing the trees in the trail area.
- That the building is so long but he does like what has been proposed for the ends of the buildings.
- The colors appear to be old and dated. He likes solid buildings of color. Solid corners with distinct center portions of the buildings.
- Phase II looks monotonous and that he was not a fan of the split faced CMU. Brick which is used in the downtown would be a better option.
- The back side of Phase I is disappointing and lacks texture.
- At the intersection of 159th and Bear Creek Parkway the building needs a focus. As proposed, there is landscaping and a sidewalk. There needs to be a terminus at this building.
- He is concerned about the use of fir and maple and how they will work in a 14 foot area. Mr. Anderson stated that they would be pushed to the property line.

Mr. Palmquist

- Seconded Craig that the applicant needed to do something special at 159th.
- Phase II uses a different language at the plaza which is different than the rest of the building. The applicant could take out some of the busyness of the rest of the building if it had distinct ends.
- Was there any consideration for anything special for the top floors?
- The project would be better with a roof garden or lofts. It would help with the verticality of the building.
- Break up the material at the base
- The applicant may wish to flip around the courtyards on Phase I as they face the north and you may wish to move them to face the street.

Mr. Sutton

- Mr. Sutton agreed that something special needs to occur at 159th as this is a great opportunity.
- This building is big and there needs to be a bigger push
- With the street, the applicant may wish to rethink which is the back of the building
- As with the Old Town Lofts, consider two distinct appearances.

Mr. Waggoner

- Mr. Waggoner agreed with Craig
- He liked the alternative brought to the meeting tonight
- The CMU that is proposed could still be used if using a dark brick. The gray is not strong enough distinction between the block and the concrete and does not work.
- There needs to be a stronger color at the top of the building. As proposed it is weak.
- This is a pretty strong start overall
- The color pallet of using blue and white in Phase II and then earth tones in Phase I. The earth tones are typical and you may want to use different accent colors in each building.

Mr. Meade

- The use of split face CMU is the wrong choice. The use of smooth face would be ok with brick colors.
- He likes the comment from Joe about the push/pull of the building
- The project is strong at the ends but loses it at the middle portions of the building.
- The rear portion is stronger than the front of the building
- The project needs more unification and stronger, richer colors
- The shed roof is not helping the project.
- Craig made a good comment about the strength of the ends of the buildings.

DISCUSSION

Design Standards Update

Mr. Sticka noted that the Planning Department is working on updating the Redmond Design Standards. It is staff's desire that the new standards will challenge the development community and result in better product.

Staff is considering a design score card similar to the Eco Score used in our landscaping in Redmond's code. The design standards would become the base code and applicants would need to obtain a minimum number of points from the design card and from the sustainability score card. Staff is interested in feedback from the Board.

Mr. Meade stated that the point total needed was too low. Mr. Sticka stated that this was only an example. Mr. Meade suggested that the point total needed to be beefed up. Mr. Sticka noted that projects that request and obtain code deviations would be required to obtain higher points on the score cards. Mr. Meade stated that he liked the deviation section.

Mr. Krueger stated that he did not like the score card system as applicants can go for the easy low-hanging fruit to obtain their required points. It would be better ask the applicant how they are doing for all of these items listed on the score card.

Mr. Palmquist stated that the sustainability card listed tree retention. He questioned goal of tree retention in urban settings. He stated that an applicant could choose LEAD and then meet the requirement.

Mr. Meade stated that points do not guarantee good design and that maybe there needs to be a way that we can get them to address all of the items in a narrative.

Mr. Waggoner suggested that there needs to be a more motivational tool and not just the obtaining of points. Staff needs to identify the things that we really want and then tie it to something that the applicant wants, such as parking. Tradeoffs.

Mr. Palmquist said that there could be a "green" card that would be citywide while a design card could be developed for the urban centers. He liked the "carrot and stick" approach suggested by Scott and tying this to their request for deviations.

Mr. Sutton noted that the 148th project had lots of variety. He suggested that the card should be tiered where the applicant needed to obtain some points from each section.

The item “variety of block angles” may not work where we want a more unified appearance.

Mr. Palmquist asked if this had been shared with the public and development community. He liked the score card idea as it became a roadmap, a more easy way to understand the code.

Ms. Vanags noted that this would replace the current design checklist and be more straightforward.

Mr. Meade noted that the live/work units seen in the projects tonight are often a disaster and falling way short. He would rather see it part of a solution but require more retail.

Mr. Krueger stated that he had worked in a building in Seattle where there was retail required but it remained vacant. Years later it was converted. Retail cannot go everywhere.

Mr. Meade stated that live/work needs to be designed in such a way that it can be converted to retail later.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5/0).

January 7, 2016

Minutes approved on

Steven Fischer

Planning Manager

(Lady of Letters was unable to attend)